



## Administration Department

P. O. Box 900  
Locust Grove, Georgia 30248

Phone: (770) 957-5043  
Facsimile (770) 954-1223

# Joint Public Safety – Answers to Questions

To: Prospective Proposers to RFP of Joint Public Safety Facility

Cc: Ron Burkhalter, Henry County SPLOST  
Jesse Patton, Police Chief  
Mayor Robert Price  
Bert Foster, Director, Community Development  
Jeff Mills, Historic Preservation Chair, DDA Board Member

From: Tim Young, City Manager

Date: February 18, 2014

Discussion Item: Answers (DRAFT) for Tuesday, February 18, 2014

---

The following questions in **BOLD** are followed in *ITALICS* with the answers generated in our meeting on Friday and subsequent revision.

### JMA Architecture

- 1. Please confirm that the total program requested for the combined facility is 33,000 sft (Police and courts at 18,000 gsf and Fire station #2 at 15,000 gsf).** *The totals given form an order of magnitude as part of the design process. There is a fairly definite figure for the Police/Courts facility portion that was previously developed and scoped as approximately 18,000 square feet. We have since discussed with Henry County SPLOST to narrow their Fire Station footprint downward to approximately 10,000 square feet; however, the overall final square footage will be developed over the process where some functions could be combined between Public Safety and Fire (fitness areas, etc). The goal of the Joint Facility to develop economies of scale than if the structures were built separately while working towards the image of the previous LGI Campus. The figures are more a rule-of-thumb guidance in the process of plan development.*
- 2. Please identify the existing structure that is to be evaluation for re-use.** *There is no building on the site for the Public Safety Facility for re-use. Please strike that language.*
- 3. Please identify the anticipated time required for the City and County to review and approve each phase submittal.** *Each phase should be able to be reviewed by staff and officials involved in ten (10) working days.*

4. **The description of deliverables for Conceptual Design indicates that drainage study calculations are to be provided; Are we to include a full site hydrology study as part of our scope and fee at this time?** *Strike the language on the drainage study calculations, as that was a cut/paste error. The matter was mentioned in the pre-proposal conference to look at drainage as an issue and as such a full site hydrology should be included as a part of the scope of work and placed into a fee appropriately.*
5. **On pages 5-6 of the RFP it is stated “Any revisions to the plans and specifications that may be required due to the inaccurate cost estimating by the consultant in the project having to be re-designed and/or re-bid, will be the responsibility of the consultant at no additional cost of the city.” It was noted at the pre-proposal conference that the work of this project would form the basis for a future design/build project with parameters that have not been defined. As the scope of this RFP is limited to 30% design, please explain more fully what is desired for this item. Strike the language to only cost estimating only. The overall scope is as follows to be more consistent with architectural procedures: (1) Programming and Master Planning; (2) CONCEPTUAL Design; (3) DESIGN DEVELOPMENT. Each phase will contain an element of cost estimating as the scope is better refined. This is more consistent with AIA practice and will mirror the revised Professional Services Contract.**
6. **On page 6 of the RFP it states “In its discussion and description of its project approach, the Consultant shall indicate the number of meeting, presentations, and site inspections (particularly with regard to the Consultant’s and Sub-Consultant’s participation in site inspections during the construction administration phase included in the base fee.” As the scope of this RFP is limited to 30% design, please explain more fully what is desired from the Consultant fro this item. As stated in the clarified scope, the site inspections for construction administration phase will not be necessary. The other meetings should be consistent with the three clarified phases above: Programming and Master Planning, Conceptual Design, Design Development.**
7. **Please provide more detail on what information is to be provided in the preliminary schedule required for Schematic Design. Schematic Design has been clarified to be Conceptual Design. There is not an individual schedule necessary for this phase.**
8. **Are the proposed layer naming standards to be a part of our submittal response to the RFP or a future submittal? This is a standard for future phases and will not be adhered to as this point in time as these are only Conceptual Design and Design Development. The CAD should only depict the layouts that can be utilized by our Community Development and Stormwater/GIS staff for depiction purposes only.**
9. **Item 4 of the proposal submittal instructions ass for the Consultants organization of “design development and construction as it relates to the City’s goal of beginning construction as soon as possible, and completing construction by the end of 2015”. It was noted at the pre-proposal conference that the work fot his project would form the basis for a future design/build project with parameters that have not been defined. As the scope of this RFP is limited to 30% design, please explain more fully what is desired from the Consultant for this item. As stated previously, the scope has been clarified to be Programming and Master Planning, Conceptual Design and Design Development. Preliminary Schedule should incorporate the entire scope for the three phases as clarified as well as the estimated duration of construction.**

**Pieper O’Brien Herr Architects:**

1. **Addenda #1 included a draft contract (Exhibit 'A') Owner/General Contractor Agreement, not an Architect/Owner draft Agreement. Will the correct document**

**be supplied prior to the submittal date so we can inform in our proposal if there are exceptions to it?** *The correct Agreement will be the AIA Owner/Architect Agreement B101™ - 2007 as modified without the later phases of development (Full Construction Plans, Bid Documents, Construction Oversight, As Built Drawings, etc.) and including the initial element of Programming and Master Plan.*

- 2. Will the selected A/E firm for this Phase I be allowed to also chase Phase II as part of the Design-Build team?** *YES. That was an issue raised by many and was found not to be an issue of any parties involved in the project.*

### **Piedmont Geotechnical Consultants**

**Question was on the matter of meeting inconsistency from the cover page and the interior sheet and whether or not that requirement would be waived.**

*The group felt that there were enough persons who raised the matter early on that week and there were over 10 agencies present at the Pre-Proposal Conference at the time specified, the issue of waiver would not be issued.*

### **DWSmith Design Group, Inc.**

**I would ask you to review the document posted online. It appears to be geared toward a General Contractor for a construction project rather than a Professional Services Agreement with Architects, Engineers, etc. for design and planning services.** *We will be using the AIA Owner/Architect Agreement B101™ - 2007 as modified without the later phases of development (Full Construction Plans, Bid Documents, Construction Oversight, As Built Drawings, etc.) and including the initial element of Programming and Master Plan. You are correct that the original Appendix A is geared more to Contractors and not to Professional Services. The AIA is a standard agreement and any exceptions would be known to the prospective firms/agencies wishing to submit.*

### **Sizemore Group**

**In the final paragraph on page 5, the proposal states “at the time of the evaluation of the existing structure to determine its use in the project.” We did not see anything else in the proposal concerning the reuse of an existing building (City Hall?) as part of the Master Planning process. Please clarify the City’s intention. Is a space allocation study for the City Hall to be included in the scope of services?** *No Study or evaluation of the existing structure. That was a carryover from another RFP. Our apologies.*

**In the first paragraph on page 6, there is a reference that the Master Planning consultant is to participate “in site inspections during construction administration phase.” Is the selected Master Planner expected to continue to consult with the City during the Design-Build process?** *As stated previously, this will culminate in Design Development that will then go forward to Design-Build. You may include a list of services with pricing should the consultant NOT be selected to be on the Design-Build Team. We’ve*

also decided *NOT* to preclude the Consultant on this project from bidding on the Design-Build.

**Thanks, again, for an informative Pre-Proposal Conference. Please post the images of the Boys' Dormitory, the 2005 floor plans and the sign-in sheet when you have a chance. We look forward to working with you to better serve the city of Locust Grove. The pictures and plats have begun to be posted to the page. We are posting the previous scanned design as well this afternoon.**

**ClarkPattersonLee:**

**Q. What is the City's intended use for the deliverables sought under this RFP?**

A. The City intends to use them to issue a future Design-Build RFP. *Correct, and the RFP scope has been clarified to more closely align with Architectural Principles.*

**Q. Will the A/E team selected for this RFP be precluded from participating on teams for the future Design-Build RFP?**

A. TBD. The City will confirm at the Mandatory Pre-Bid Meeting on 11 February, 2014. *As stated previously, there is NO PRECLUSION from participating on teams for the future Design-Build.*

**Q. How were the building areas derived?**

A. They were taken from a design for the police station component previously planned at a different site (produced by Stantec) as well as Henry County's fire station standards. *As clarified, the building areas for Courts and Police are fairly well known. The Fire department standards have been revised to a more modest 10,000 square feet. HOWEVER, the overall final square footage will be developed over the process where some functions could be combined between Public Safety and Fire (fitness areas, etc). The goal of the Joint Facility to develop economies of scale than if the structures were built separately while working towards the image of the previous LGI Campus. The figures are more a rule-of-thumb guidance in the process of plan development.*

*Page – 5 During the course of providing design and engineering services, the selected consultant shall prepare four (4) detailed cost estimates of the work and submit to the City for review and approval at the conclusion of and with the program and master planning document, at the time of the evaluation of the existing structure to determine its use in the project, and at the conclusion of and with the submittal of the preliminary design and the scoping document*

**Based on the excerpt from the RFP above, our understanding of the quantity of estimates and the timing are:**

**1 – *at the conclusion of and with the program and master planning document***

~~2 - at the time of the evaluation of the existing structure to determine its use in the project~~ This element has been removed as previously discussed from the scope.

3 - at the conclusion of the submittal of the preliminary design and the scoping document

4 - at the submittal of the preliminary design and the scoping document

**Q. Please Confirm.**

**Q. Please identify the “existing structure” referenced in #2 above. Item #2 should be removed. No existing structure to re-use and evaluate.**

**Q. Please clarify if “preliminary design and scoping document” in #3 above is referring to “Schematic Design” or “Conceptual Design” phase as noted on page 5 of the RFP (see excerpt below).**

*The project process will include the following phases:*

- *Programming and Master Planning;*
- *Schematic Design; REVISED to Concept Design*
- *Conceptual Design, including cost estimating; REVISED to Design Development, including cost estimating.*

NOTE: Cost estimating at each phase noted previously.

*Page 5-6 - Any revisions to the plans and specifications that may be required due to inaccurate cost estimates by the consultant resulting in the project having to be re-designed and/or re-bid, will be the responsibility of the consultant at no additional costs to the City. The consultant shall make presentations to City staff at each phase of design as outlined above and shall receive and incorporate comments into the documents as directed by staff. In its discussion and description of its project approach, the Consultant shall indicate the number of meetings, presentations, and site inspections (particularly with regard to the Consultant's and Sub-consultants' participation in site inspections during the construction administration phase) included in the base fee. The consultant shall prepare and distribute minutes of all design and pre-construction phase meetings. City will expect a package of deliverables above and beyond the deliverables required by any other State or City agency; for example the Community Development, Public Works, Public Safety, and Henry County, etc. All labor and materials provided by the consultant to satisfy the requirements of any such reviewing or permitting agency are to be included in the base fee and will not be considered for further reimbursement.*

**The underlined language from the RFP above suggests that there is scope during the Permit Phase, Bid Phase and Construction Phase, yet the deliverables are only a 30% design.**

**Q. Please clarify deliverables/scope required during Permit, Bid and Construction Phases.**

*The project process will include the following phases:*

- *Programming and Master Planning;*
- *Schematic Design;*
- *Conceptual Design, including cost estimating;*

**In reference to the language from the RFP above, Programming/Master Planning as well as Schematic Design are well-defined, industry accepted terms with deliverable scopes defined by the AIA practice standards. Conceptual design typically *precedes* Schematic Design and is not as well-defined by industry standards. It appears what the City is seeking is referred to in AIA practice standards as “Design Development” documents. We raise this issue only to insure that all proposing consultants are offering the City the same scope, which can be measured by a well-defined, industry accepted phases and terms.**

*You are correct on the order and AIA practice standards. As such we have noted the following as stated previously in this document:*

- *Programming and Master Planning;*
- *Schematic Design; REVISED to Concept Design*
- *Conceptual Design, including cost estimating; REVISED to Design Development, including cost estimating.*

**Q. Please confirm our interpretation that it is the City’s intent that the “Conceptual Design” phase is equivalent to “Design Development” documents.**

*As previously stated, we’ve revised to follow more accepted AIA standards for the respective Scope of Work.*